

## Aggregator-Neutral Records vs. Registry of Digital Masters

Background document:

- 1) A brief statement of the problem: The CONSER database and the Digital Library Federation Registry of Digital Masters (RDM) use the same repository (OCLC), but have different standards for cataloging. Under current CONSER/OCLC practice, records created or edited for the RDM (or under its guidelines) are subject to deletion as duplicates or editing to make them aggregator-neutral. This defeats the RDM's purpose. Many local and regional agencies use similar schemes to create reproduction records. CONSER libraries in such systems must create extensive local-only records that cannot be retained on OCLC. This limits access to such records by researchers who use WorldCat as a research database.
- 2) Possible solutions:
  - a) Allow libraries contributing to RDM to create duplicate I-level records coded with 042 dlr.
    - i) Advantages: Does not require revision of CONSER practice.
    - ii) Disadvantages:
      - (1) Does not provide a means for libraries using RDM model for records that represent items not eligible for the repository itself.
      - (2) CONSER libraries would be forced to create original records for serials at a lower level.
  - b) Create additional record coding for reproduction records created according to the guidelines, whether or not the materials represented are eligible for the RDM.
    - i) Advantages: Allows local or regional systems to create shareable records for all types of local reproduction cataloging.
    - ii) Disadvantages:
      - (1) Adds to a proliferation of codes
      - (2) Undermines the aggregator-neutral concept.

Other solutions from the floor? Are there any other CONSER representatives working with agencies that intend to contribute to the RDM, or to emulate its cataloging approach?